

# NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

2

LAS CRUCES  
NEW MEXICO  
88001

## SPECIAL REPORT

TELEPHONE:  
LAS CRUCES, N. M.  
505-646-2611

Grantee

New Mexico State University

Las Cruces, New Mexico

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

### Title

Public Burden and Benefit of the Apollo Program  
on Las Cruces, New Mexico

NASA Grant No. NGR-32-003-027

Robert W. Beckstead, Ph. D.  
Associate Professor of Economics

Prepared at the Research Center  
October 1967

N 68-29982  
(ACCESSION NUMBER)  
28  
(PAGES)  
CR-89946  
(NASA CR OR TMX OR AD NUMBER)  
(THRU)  
1  
(CODE)  
34  
(CATEGORY)  
FACILITY FORM 602

X 68-35258  
(ACCESSION NUMBER)  
28  
(PAGES)  
CR#89946  
(NASA CR OR TMX OR AD NUMBER)  
(THRU)  
5A  
(CODE)  
34  
(CATEGORY)  
FF No. 602(A)  
AVAILABLE TO NASA OFFICES AND NASA  
RESEARCH CENTERS ONLY

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT. . . . .                        | iii  |
| INTRODUCTION. . . . .                    | 1    |
| METHODOLOGY . . . . .                    | 1    |
| THE PUBLIC BURDEN AND BENEFIT . . . . .  | 3    |
| The Total Budget . . . . .               | 3    |
| Effects by Family Income Groups. . . . . | 7    |
| CONCLUSION. . . . .                      | 9    |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .                | 10   |
| APPENDIX I. . . . .                      | 11   |
| APPENDIX II . . . . .                    | 16   |
| APPENDIX III. . . . .                    | 17   |

# LIST OF TABLES

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| I     The Revenue and Cost of Public Services for Apollo<br>Families, Fiscal Year 1966. . . . .  | 4    |
| II    The Average Family Surplus and Deficit for Government<br>Services by Income Groups, Fiscal Year 1966 . . . . .                       | 8    |
| III   Total Revenue and Cost for all Divisions for Apollo<br>Families in the Sample, Fiscal Year 1966. . . . .                             | 17   |
| IV    Estimated Tax Contributions of Apollo Families,<br>Fiscal Year 1966. . . . .   | 20   |
| V     Total Revenue and Cost of Public Services of Families<br>in the Sample by Income Groups, Fiscal Year 1966. . . . .                   | 21   |
| VI    Average Property Assessment by Family Size, Fiscal<br>Year 1966 . . . . .  | 22   |
| VII   Number & Proportion of School Children of Apollo<br>Families Enrolled in Las Cruces Public Schools,<br>1965-66 School Year . . . . . | 23   |
| VIII   Enrollment of Children of Apollo Families by School<br>and Grade, 1965-66 School Year. . . . .                                      | 24   |

## ABSTRACT

At a time when most cities in the country are actively campaigning to attract new industry, it seems appropriate to study the basic public burden and benefit derived from introducing new industry into a community. This is a case study wherein an attempt is made to measure the public burden and benefit of the Apollo program on Las Cruces, New Mexico. Public burden was defined as the operational and capital costs incurred by the local government when public services were provided, and public benefit was defined in terms of monies received by local government in taxes, licenses, federal aid, and state aid. The measurement of the public burden and benefit was restricted to the 1966 fiscal year, and the following factors were considered in the analysis: number of employees, family size, number of school children, property assessment and mill levies, number of automobiles, miles driven in automobiles, income, consumption, federal and state-aid to the Las Cruces School System, and the Las Cruces School District and Las Cruces city budgets.

Overall the public benefit from the Apollo program is greater than the public burden or cost by about 20 percent. In particular, the revenue for public education exceeded the cost of educating the children of the Apollo families by 35 percent. This is due mostly to the fact that two-thirds of the families did not have children in the public schools. On

the other hand for those families with children in the public schools, the average educational cost per family exceeded the average revenue per family by 10 percent. Receipts for utilities, sanitation, and health services were greater than the costs of rendering these kinds of services by 38 percent.

This excess was mostly due to the municipal natural gas service which operated at a 25 percent profit rate. There was little difference between the revenues and cost estimates for streets and airports. However, one and a half miles of new paved roads were added to the city streets as a result of new housing developments that accommodated the Apollo families. For general administrative services the Apollo families paid 17 percent more than it cost to service them on a per capita basis. Of all the major service divisions only police and fire protection and recreation services cost more than the families paid. The revenue amounted to only 55 percent of the cost of supplying police and fire protection and nearly 75 percent of the cost of recreation.

There is little doubt that the Apollo program has been a great public benefit to the City of Las Cruces. The most significant reason for this is that the wealth and income levels of the families employed at the Apollo site are above the community average. As a result the value of the average tax base in the community was increased with the introduction of the Apollo program.

## INTRODUCTION

At a time when most cities in the country are actively campaigning to attract new industry, it seems appropriate to study the basic public burden and benefit derived from introducing new industry into a community. This is a case study wherein an attempt is made to measure the public burden and benefit of the Apollo program on Las Cruces, New Mexico.

First, a brief description of the major economic sectors that have influenced employment in Las Cruces is presented. Agriculture, New Mexico State University and commerce were the leading sources of employment in the community prior to World War II. With the installation of the White Sands Missile Range after World War II and later the construction of the Apollo site, the structure of employment in Las Cruces has changed. Today the federal government and New Mexico State University are the two most important sources of employment in the community. The installation of the Apollo program began in Las Cruces in 1963. By the summer of 1966, when this study was conducted, 1,500 persons were employed at the site of which about 85 percent resided in Las Cruces. The Apollo program started in Las Cruces at the time when employment at the White Sands Missile Range was decreasing and the community generally was experiencing a leveling off in economic growth. Since 1963, the resurgence in economic activity has come mostly as a result of the installation of the Apollo site.

## METHODOLOGY

It is axiomatic that data are no better than the methods used to develop them. Therefore, a brief statement explaining the method of analysis is expedient.

Public burden is defined as the operational and capital costs incurred by the local government when public services are provided. Public benefit is defined in terms of monies received by the local government in taxes, licenses, federal aid and state aid. Data were collected in line with the definitions. The major city taxes, licenses and fees that could be identified directly with the Apollo families were computed. Since the federal and state-aid for educational purposes was calculated on a per student basis, these revenues were computed according to the number of public school children among the Apollo families. All other sources of revenue were computed as though the local businesses had shifted these taxes, licenses and fees on to the consumer. These resources were, therefore, calculated on a per capita basis. Since the burden or cost of government service could not be identified directly with the families, the cost was figured on a per capita basis except for education and streets where the cost was calculated on a per student and automobile basis respectively.

The measurement of the public burden and benefit was restricted to the 1966 fiscal year. For the 1,030 families in the survey, the following factors were considered in the analysis: number of employees, family size, number of school children, property assessment and mill levies, number of automobiles, miles driven in automobiles, income, consumption, federal and state-aid to the Las Cruces School System, and the Las Cruces School District and Las Cruces city budgets. The Las Cruces School District budget is separate from the city budget.

The Las Cruces city budget for 1965-1966 was determined by itemizing expected resources and by anticipating requirements for each major division. The organization of the resources in the city budget by the type of service

rendered made it possible to analyze the effects of the Apollo program on a service division basis as well as for the total governmental operation.

It may be observed that the measurement of the basic public burden and benefit is confined to the direct and indirect payments of local taxes, licenses and fees of the people employed at the Apollo site. There are undoubtedly greater effects from the installation of the Apollo site on the local government than those directly associated with the Apollo people. Secondary effects are likely to develop when additional businesses enter to provide consumer services for the new families. The precise extent of the secondary effects has not been quantified. Therefore, no attempt has been made to measure these additional public burden and benefit effects.

#### THE PUBLIC BURDEN AND BENEFIT

When new families locate in a community, the public services of that community are made available regardless of the economic resources of the family. Therefore, one might say that communities should seek new industry that will attract new families to the community whose contributions would be equal to or greater than the burden incurred by providing them with public goods and services. It is in this manner that an evaluation of the effects of the Apollo program on Las Cruces is made.

#### The Total Budget

The total revenue resource of the Apollo families amounted to \$1,131,000 as compared to a total cost of \$957,800. This means that revenue resources exceeded the service requirement by \$173,300 or nearly 20 percent (see Table I). The major part of the total surplus came from the education and utility, sanitation and health divisions. On the other



hand, the resources for recreation and police and fire protection were insufficient to cover the costs of service.

TABLE I

THE REVENUE AND COST OF PUBLIC SERVICES  
FOR APOLLO FAMILIES  
FISCAL YEAR 1966

| Division                            | Revenue     | Cost      | Dollar<br>Difference | Percentage<br>Difference |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Education                           | \$ 551,600  | \$408,500 | + \$143,000          | + 35                     |
| Utilities, Sanitation<br>and Health | 302,600     | 255,400   | + 47,200             | + 18                     |
| Streets                             | 224,500     | 222,400   | + 2,100              | + 1                      |
| General Administration              | 20,400      | 17,400    | + 3,000              | + 17                     |
| Police and Fire                     | 23,500      | 42,500    | - 19,000             | - 45                     |
| Recreation                          | 8,500       | 11,600    | - 3,100              | - 27                     |
| TOTAL                               | \$1,131,100 | \$957,800 | + \$173,300          | + 18                     |

By analyzing the factors that make up the total budget, it may be possible to explain some of the reasons why the Apollo program has been beneficial to the community as viewed from the public sector.

Education As would be expected, the educational division demanded the largest amount of revenue and incurred the greatest cost. A total of \$551,600 was made available to the Las Cruces public schools while the cost of educating the children amounted to \$408,500. This showed that for educational purposes revenues exceeded costs by 35 percent. There are three major reasons why this surplus should have been generated. First, only one-third of the Apollo families had children enrolled in the public schools, which meant that far more families contributed revenue to education than required educational service. Second, the basic support program

of the state for education contributed about 55 percent of the total educational revenue. The federal support program for school children of families employed at the Apollo installation provided 25 percent of the total educational revenue. As a result, 80 percent of the total revenue for education came from sources other than the Apollo families. Third, the average wealth and income level of these families was above the community average. Therefore, the value of the average tax base in the community was increased as a result of the Apollo program.

It is interesting to note that for those families who do have school children, the average educational cost per family exceeded the average revenue by 10 percent. Only those with one child in school provided a surplus. This surplus averaged \$10 per family. For those families which had from two to eight children in the public schools, an average deficit or burden of \$48 was incurred. The average deficit ranged from \$35 per family with two school children to \$400 per family with eight children. It was also observed that the deficit increased at a faster rate when there were five or more school children per family. This may be explained by the fact that the average level of wealth and income of those families with five or more school children was progressively below the overall averages for all Apollo families.

The impact of the Apollo families on school enrollment and construction is noteworthy. The construction of two elementary schools, a junior high school and a high school have been completed since the installation of the Apollo site. Although their children only represent 7 percent of the school children in the Las Cruces school system, the percentages ranged as high as 25 in the newly constructed schools.

Utilities, Sanitation and Health      The City of Las Cruces provides the common utilities, sanitation and health services. In addition the City operates a municipal natural gas enterprise. The importance of the municipal natural gas enterprise to the City is illustrated by the fact that it is the number one source of city revenue.

Revenue acquired from providing utilities, sanitation and health services amounted to \$302,600, whereas the cost of rendering this service was \$255,400. This represented an excess of \$47,200 or 18 percent. Receipts from natural gas and sewer facilities accounted for all of the surplus since revenues equalled the costs of providing water and garbage collection services. Since the municipal natural gas enterprise operates at a 25 percent rate of profit, this revenue source accounted for the majority of the surplus. As would be expected, the profits from the sale of natural gas are allocated to other divisions of the city government as needed.

Streets      The Apollo program has had a significant effect upon the construction of new roads and streets in Las Cruces since about 40 percent of the families live in new houses. During fiscal year 1966, it was estimated that one and a half miles of new paved roads were added to the city streets as a result of new housing developments that accommodated the Apollo families. Furthermore, an additional three miles of paved streets had been constructed prior to fiscal year 1966.

There was no significant difference between the revenues and costs estimated for the construction and maintenance of city streets. However, of the \$224,500 contributed about 95 percent was for the construction of new streets.

Other Services      The revenues made available to the three remaining divisions constituted only 5 percent of the total revenue resource. At the same time the cost of these services represented 7 percent of the total cost. In the general administration division revenues exceeded costs by 17 percent. This excess was mostly due to building permit fees. Since the Apollo program has greatly affected the residential construction sector of the Las Cruces economy, this phenomenon is only natural.

The two remaining divisions--police and fire protection and recreation--were the only ones wherein the costs of supplying these services were greater than the revenues derived. The combined deficit of these services was \$22,100 of which the greater majority occurred in the police and fire division. The revenues amounted to only 55 percent of the cost of supplying police and fire protection and nearly 75 percent of the cost of providing recreational services.

Effects by Family Income Groups

In order to observe how the revenues and costs to the City of Las Cruces varied with family income, the incomes of the Apollo families were arranged within five general groups (\$4,999 and below, \$5,000 to \$9,999, \$10,000 to \$14,999, \$15,000 to \$19,999 and \$20,000 and above). It was found that families with higher incomes experienced the greatest surpluses or incurred the smallest deficits and vice versa (see Table II). Although this result is to be expected, this analysis showed on the average that those families with annual incomes of less than \$5,000 failed to generate sufficient revenue to cover the cost of providing them with government services. For those families with annual incomes of \$5,000 or more, the average surplus ranged from \$35.65 per family for the \$5,000 to \$9,999

income group to a high of \$152.49 per family for the \$20,000 and above income group.

TABLE II

THE AVERAGE FAMILY SURPLUS AND DEFICIT  
FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES BY INCOME GROUPS  
FISCAL YEAR 1966

| Income                | Education | Utilities,<br>Sanitation<br>& Health | Streets  | General<br>Adminis-<br>tration | Police<br>& Fire | Recrea-<br>tion | Total      |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------|
| \$ 4,999<br>& below   | - \$ 7.44 | + \$17.73                            | + \$0.64 | - \$ 2.77                      | - \$17.83        | - \$2.85        | - \$ 12.52 |
| \$ 5,000--<br>9,999   | + 20.43   | + 27.60                              | + 0.78   | + 4.24                         | + 14.96          | - 2.44          | + 35.65    |
| 10,000--<br>14,999    | + 20.43   | + 38.98                              | + 1.86   | + 13.88                        | - 13.87          | - 2.32          | + 63.08    |
| \$15,000--<br>19,999  | + 23.76   | + 47.70                              | + 3.22   | + 17.40                        | - 13.35          | - 2.27          | + 76.46    |
| \$20,000--<br>& above | + 57.30   | + 68.20                              | + 4.94   | + 33.16                        | - 9.37           | - 1.74          | + 152.49   |
| + (Surplus)           |           |                                      |          |                                |                  |                 |            |
| - (Deficit)           |           |                                      |          |                                |                  |                 |            |

It is interesting to note that only for the government divisions of streets and utilities, sanitation and health did average surpluses per family occur in all income groups. These average surpluses ranged from \$0.64 to \$4.94 per family in the street division and from \$17.73 to \$68.20 per family in the division of utilities, sanitation and health. At the same time average deficits appeared for all income groups in the divisions of police and fire protection and recreation. The largest deficits occurred at the lower income levels. The average deficits varied between \$9.37 and \$17.83 per family in the division of police and fire protection and between \$1.74 and \$2.85 per family in the division of recreation. In the

case of education and general administration services, only those families with annual incomes of less than \$5,000 showed an average deficit. The deficits amounted to \$7.49 and \$2.77 respectively.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion there is little doubt that the Apollo program has been a great benefit to the City of Las Cruces. The nature of the program has attracted to Las Cruces a highly skilled and technical labor force with the accompanying higher levels of income and wealth. For example, the per capita income of the Apollo families is estimated to be \$3,125 which is 17 percent above the per capita level for the rest of the community. As a result, the value of the average tax base in the community was increased with the introduction of the Apollo program.

It was further pointed out that with the present city tax structure and federal and state-aid programs, only families with annual incomes of less than \$5,000 are likely to incur greater costs than they provide revenue for public services.

Inasmuch as the educational division accounted for about 80 percent of the total revenue surplus, the federal support programs to education should not be minimized. During the 1965-1966 school year, the federal government provided \$107,000 to the local school district to assist in covering the cost of educating the school children of the Apollo families. This contribution alone accounted for 60 percent of the total revenue surplus. Thus, without this additional source of revenue there would have been little difference between the total revenue received and the total cost of providing public services to these families.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is indebted to Sandra B. Daniel for her able research assistance.

Appreciation is also expressed for the cooperation received from city and county government officials for their making available the necessary records and reports.

This project was supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (Grant No. NGR-32-003-027).

## APPENDIX I

METHOD OF COMPUTING REVENUE AND COST  
PER DIVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICEEducation

Data were received from the Superintendent's Office of the Las Cruces School District and the publications New Mexico Public School Finance Statistics, Fiscal Year 1965-1966, Department of Finance and Administration and Public School Budget, 1965-1966, Las Cruces School District No. 2. The sources of revenue were federal aid, state aid, local property tax, and automobile license. The amount of contribution was calculated in the following manner:

- (1) Federal aid equaled \$117.00 per student whose parents worked at the Apollo site.
- (2) State aid was \$268.00 per student.
- (3) Local property tax was calculated on the basis of the respective mill levies and the property assessment—18.264 mills for property located in Las Cruces, 18.229 for property situated in Mesilla Park, and 75 percent of the county wide assessment of 5.000 mills.
- (4) Automobile license fee amounted to \$1.15 per automobile. The average automobile license tax was ascertained by taking a random sample of 155 cars that were registered at the Apollo site. The license fee is based on the weight of the car and model year. It was determined that the average license tax for the Apollo families amounted to \$18.50 with a standard error of the mean of \$1.65. Since 6.2 percent of the automobile license fee goes to education, a total of \$1.15 per automobile was collected.

The cost of education was computed on a per student basis and included transportation and capital outlays in addition to the general operation expenses. The cost per student amounted to \$444.00.



Utilities, Sanitation and Health

The major source of information came from interviews with city officials, the city's budget estimates for Fiscal Year 1965-1966 and the statement of bonded indebtedness--General Obligation Bonds--as of June 30, 1965. The revenue and cost calculations are as follows:

- (1) Natural Gas receipts per family were estimated by city officials at \$96.00 annually, and the cost of service was estimated at \$72.00 annually. Since the Apollo families have average incomes higher than the average incomes of the remaining Las Cruces families, these figures should be considered as conservative estimates.
- (2) Water charges were estimated by city officials to be annually \$48.00 per family. This is an average figure and does not represent a fixed charge. In addition, a general obligation bond for capital improvements was another source of revenue and collection was estimated to be 3.747 mills on the assessed valuation of property. The annual cost of water service to the City was \$48.00 per family plus \$11.66 per family to cover the interest and sinking requirements on the general obligation bonds.
- (3) The annual revenue from sewer service represents the service charge of \$12.00 plus 7.494 mills on assessed valuation of property to cover the general obligation bonds. In addition a federal grant on a 50 percent matching basis was included. The calculated amount was 2.987 mills of assessed property. The computed cost of providing sewer service on an annual basis was stated by government officials to be \$12.00 per family plus \$19.34 per family for interest and sinking requirements on General Obligation Bonds.
- (4) Revenue from garbage collection amounted to \$24.00 annually per family and the computed expense of this service was also \$24.00 annually per family.

Streets

City officials and government reports were the major sources of information. However, additional data on annual automobile mileage for one, two, three, and four-car families were obtained from the Allstate Insurance Company. Also local gas station managers were contacted to determine the

use of regular and premium gasolines in the community. Revenues came from the following sources:

- (1) The gasoline tax was estimated at annual rates of \$6.40 for one-car families, \$8.53 for two-car families, \$10.80 for three-car families, and \$12.00 for four-car families. This assumed that the gasoline usage was on the basis of two-thirds regular and one-third premium and further that 80 percent of the driving occurred in Las Cruces.
- (2) Parking meter revenues were figured on a per automobile basis which amounted to \$.85.
- (3) Revenues from general obligation bonds came from a 2.018 mill levy on assessed property.
- (4) It was estimated that the average street cost for new houses would amount to \$1,203.00 per 75-front-foot lot. Therefore, this figure constituted revenue as well as cost to the City.

The cost calculations for streets were figured on a per automobile basis and amounted to \$9.62 annually. Also the \$1,203.00 per 75-front-foot lot of newly constructed houses were included in the total cost of streets.

#### General Administration

Information on general administration receipts and expenses was obtained from local government officials and city reports. Revenues came from the franchise taxes, miscellaneous permits, miscellaneous services, and paving districts. These revenues were calculated on a per capita basis. In addition building permit revenue was figured on the basis of \$1.50 on the first \$1,000 valuation and subsequently \$1.00 per \$1,000 of added valuation of the structure. Automobile license fee also provide revenue for general administration and it contributed \$2.04 per automobile annually. The City receives 10 percent of the automobile licenses registered in the county plus 6.7 percent of an additional 15 percent of automobile license fee. Also collections on a general obligation bond

for flood protection and public safety building were credited to the general administration division. This amounted to .865 mills on assessed property.

The cost of the general administration service is of such a general purpose that the cost was figured on a per capita basis.

#### Police and Fire

The city budget was the source of data for the police and fire division. Collection as a per capita basis (\$3.00 per person) was computed from occupational licenses, liquor licenses, fines and fees, and the fire fund. It was assumed that businesses would pass these taxes and fees on to the consumer in the prices of goods and services. There is also 2.225 mills on assessed property which is collected for police and fire protection.

The expense of police and fire protection was allocated on a per capita basis which meant that \$9.25 would be collected.

#### Recreation

The city budget constituted the major source of information. Because of the general purpose of recreation the revenues and costs were estimated on a per capita basis. The major sources of revenue for recreation are Branigan estate, swimming pools, cigarette tax, and miscellaneous fees. It should also be noted that a .288 mill levy on assessed property was collected to cover park improvements with a general obligation bond.

#### Conclusion

In conclusion, the revenue sources referred to were those available to the City of Las Cruces for the 1965-1966 budget. Since that time the city sales tax has been added as a source of revenue. Also when reference

was made to costs or expenses, the calculations always took into consideration the personnel, operating, and capital costs for the period plus interest and sinking requirements of general obligation bonds of previous periods.

## APPENDIX II

## SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AVERAGE APOLLO FAMILY

Just what are some of the characteristics of the average Apollo family residing in Las Cruces? The family comprises nearly four persons and one-third of the families have children attending the public schools. There is a 55 percent chance that the family is buying its own house and owns two automobiles. The average income amounts to nearly \$11,000 and per capita income was \$3,175. The average dwelling unit is assessed at \$3,400 and the average annual property tax amounts to about \$175. Estimates of additional local tax payments per family were \$45 in city sales tax, \$50 in city gasoline tax, and \$25 in automobile license fees. Cigarette tax, liquor tax, fees and fines were calculated to be about \$30 per family. In addition because of the nature of federal and state-aid to education in Las Cruces, the federal government supplied \$117 per school child from Apollo families and state provided \$268 per school child during the 1965-66 school year.

## APPENDIX III

TABLE III

TOTAL REVENUE AND COST FOR ALL DIVISIONS  
FOR APOLLO FAMILIES IN THE SAMPLE,  
FISCAL YEAR 1966

Education

## Revenue

|                    |              |
|--------------------|--------------|
| Federal aid        | \$107,640    |
| State aid          | 246,560      |
| Property tax       | 74,033       |
| Automobile license | <u>1,328</u> |

Total \$429,561

Cost \$408,480

difference +\$21,081

Utilities, Sanitation and Health

## Revenue

|                     |               |
|---------------------|---------------|
| Natural gas         | \$ 99,552     |
| Water fee           | 49,776        |
| Water GOB*          | 12,661        |
| Sewer fee           | 12,444        |
| Sewer GOB*          | 25,321        |
| Sewer Federal Grant | 10,093        |
| Garbage collection  | <u>24,888</u> |

Total \$234,736

## Cost

|                    |               |
|--------------------|---------------|
| Natural gas        | 78,812        |
| Water              | 61,867        |
| Sewer              | 32,500        |
| Garbage collection | <u>24,888</u> |

Total \$198,067

difference +\$36,669

\*General Obligation Bond

Table III - continued

Streets

|               |                |           |
|---------------|----------------|-----------|
| Revenue       |                |           |
| Gasoline tax  | \$ 7,215       |           |
| Parking meter | 1,170          |           |
| New building  | 204,911        |           |
| GOB*          | <u>6,819</u>   |           |
| Total         |                | \$220,615 |
| Cost          |                |           |
| Per auto      | 13,247         |           |
| New building  | <u>204,911</u> |           |
| Total         |                | \$218,158 |
| difference    |                | +\$2,457  |

General Administration

|                    |              |           |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------|
| Revenue            |              |           |
| Per capita         | \$ 5,267     |           |
| Automobile license | 2,356        |           |
| Building permits   | 5,509        |           |
| Miscellaneous      | <u>2,923</u> |           |
| Total              |              | \$ 16,055 |
| Cost               |              | \$ 13,524 |
| difference         |              | +\$2,531  |

Police and Fire

|              |              |           |
|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| Revenue      |              |           |
| Per capita   | \$ 10,677    |           |
| Property tax | <u>7,518</u> |           |
| Total        |              | \$ 18,195 |
| Cost         |              | \$ 32,921 |
| difference   |              | -\$14,726 |

\*General Obligation Bond

Table III - continued

Recreation

|            |            |          |
|------------|------------|----------|
| Revenue    |            |          |
| Per capita | \$ 5,623   |          |
| Park GOB*  | <u>973</u> |          |
| Total      |            | \$ 6,596 |
| Cost       |            | \$ 9,040 |
| difference |            | -\$2,444 |

\*General Obligation Bond



TABLE IV  
ESTIMATED TAX CONTRIBUTIONS OF APOLLO  
FAMILIES, FISCAL YEAR 1966

|                                     | <u>Sample total</u> | <u>Estimate Grand Total</u> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Federal Income Tax <sup>1,2</sup>   | \$ 956,323          | \$1,468,000                 |
| State Income Tax <sup>1,2</sup>     | 91,718              | 141,000                     |
| State Sales Tax <sup>2</sup>        | 139,741             | 201,000                     |
| Las Cruces Sales Tax <sup>2,6</sup> | 46,580              | 67,000                      |
| Property Tax <sup>3</sup>           | 173,646             | 228,000                     |
| Gasoline Tax <sup>4</sup>           | 50,533              | 65,000                      |
| Automobile License <sup>5</sup>     | <u>21,368</u>       | <u>30,000</u>               |
| Total                               | \$1,479,909         | \$2,200,000                 |

<sup>1</sup>Based on the standard 10 percent deductions plus exemptions for dependents.

<sup>2</sup>Incomes of 847 families were included in the sample.

<sup>3</sup>There were 995 families in the sample.

<sup>4</sup>Some 1002 automobiles were in the sample.

<sup>5</sup>A total of 882 automobiles licensed in New Mexico in the sample.

<sup>6</sup>Since a Las Cruces sales tax did not exist in fiscal 1966, this figure only represents a potential contribution in relation to the given incomes.

TABLE V  
TOTAL REVENUE AND COST OF PUBLIC SERVICES OF FAMILIES  
IN THE SAMPLE BY INCOME GROUPS, FISCAL YEAR 1966

|                                      | 0-\$4,999 |           | \$5,000-\$9,999 |           | \$10,000-\$14,999 |           | \$15,000-\$19,999 |           | \$20,000 and Up |           |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
|                                      | Revenue   | Cost      | Revenue         | Cost      | Revenue           | Cost      | Revenue           | Cost      | Revenue         | Cost      |
| Education                            | \$ 27,450 | \$ 27,970 | \$102,030       | \$ 95,900 | \$132,230         | \$124,760 | \$ 75,750         | \$ 72,370 | \$ 14,870       | \$ 13,320 |
| Utilities,<br>Sanitation<br>& Health | 14,610    | 13,370    | 65,800          | 57,490    | 70,370            | 58,450    | 33,900            | 27,120    | 7,000           | 5,160     |
| Streets                              | 5,210     | 5,180     | 45,360          | 45,130    | 80,150            | 79,580    | 40,070            | 39,610    | 10,170          | 10,030    |
| General<br>Adm.                      | 880       | 950       | 5,820           | 3,840     | 9,210             | 4,040     | 4,930             | 1,950     | 1,380           | 360       |
| Police and<br>Fire                   | 1,060     | 2,310     | 4,850           | 9,350     | 5,580             | 9,820     | 2,840             | 4,740     | 620             | 870       |
| Recreation                           | 440       | 640       | 1,830           | 2,570     | 1,990             | 2,700     | 980               | 1,300     | 190             | 240       |
| Total                                | \$ 50,250 | \$ 50,420 | \$225,690       | \$214,280 | \$299,530         | \$279,350 | \$158,470         | \$147,090 | \$ 34,230       | \$ 29,980 |
| Total Per<br>Family                  | \$718     | \$720     | \$750           | \$712     | \$980             | \$913     | \$1,116           | \$1,035   | \$1,268         | \$1,110   |

TABLE VI  
AVERAGE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT BY FAMILY SIZE,  
FISCAL YEAR 1966

| <u>Family Size</u> | <u>Average Property Assessment</u> |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| 3                  | \$3,206                            |
| 4                  | 3,876                              |
| 5                  | 4,120                              |
| 6                  | 4,443                              |
| 7                  | 1,981                              |
| 8                  | 1,777                              |
| 9                  | 1,100                              |
| 10                 | 3,650                              |

TABLE VII  
NUMBER & PROPORTION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN OF APOLLO FAMILIES  
ENROLLED IN LAS CRUCES PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
1965-66 SCHOOL YEAR

| School           | No. of<br>Apollo<br>School<br>Children<br>1965-66 | Total<br>School<br>Enrollment<br>1965-66 | Percent<br>of<br>Apollo<br>Students |
|------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Elementary       |   |  |                                     |
| Alameda          | 85  | 658                                      | 12.9                                |
| Bradley          | 5   | 477                                      | 1.0                                 |
| Central          | 63  | 678                                      | 9.3                                 |
| Conlee           | 77  | 888                                      | 8.7                                 |
| Dona Ana         | 3   | 188                                      | 1.6                                 |
| East Picacho     | 8   | 144                                      | 5.6                                 |
| Fairacres        | 2   | 225                                      | 0.9                                 |
| Hermosa Heights  | 24  | 501                                      | 4.8                                 |
| Loma Heights     | 71  | 301                                      | 23.6                                |
| Lucero           | 17  | 398                                      | 4.3                                 |
| MacArthur        | 18  | 466                                      | 3.9                                 |
| Mesilla          | 16  | 593                                      | 2.7                                 |
| Mesilla Park     | 26  | 829                                      | 3.1                                 |
| University Hills | 95  | 453                                      | 21.0                                |
| Valley View      | 15  | 448                                      | 3.3                                 |
| Washington       | <u>26</u>   | <u>472</u>                               | <u>5.5</u>                          |
| Total            | 551   | 7,719                                    | 7.1                                 |
| Junior High      |   |  |                                     |
| Alameda          | 111   | 1,155                                    | 9.6                                 |
| Court            | 25  | 1,103                                    | 2.2                                 |
| Lynn             | <u>89</u>   | <u>929</u>                               | <u>9.6</u>                          |
| Total            | 225   | 3,187                                    | 7.1                                 |
| Senior High      |   |  |                                     |
| Las Cruces       | 86  | 1,807                                    | 4.8                                 |
| Mayfield         | <u>58</u>   | <u>717</u>                               | <u>8.1</u>                          |
| Total            | 144   | 2,524                                    | 5.7                                 |
| TOTALS           | 920   | 13,430                                   | 6.9                                 |

TABLE VIII  
ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN OF APOLLO FAMILIES  
BY SCHOOL AND GRADE  
1965-66 SCHOOL YEAR

| School              | School Grades |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Total | Percent<br>of<br>Total |
|---------------------|---------------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|------------------------|
|                     | 1             | 2    | 3    | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |                        |
| Elementary          |               |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |                        |
| Alameda             | 15            | 12   | 19   | 10  | 16  | 13  |     |     |     |     |     |     | 85    | 9.2                    |
| Bradley             | 3             |      | 1    |     | 1   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5     | 0.5                    |
| Central             | 13            | 14   | 18   | 2   | 9   | 7   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 63    | 6.9                    |
| Conlee              | 13            | 14   | 17   | 14  | 12  | 7   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 77    | 8.4                    |
| Dona Ana            | 2             |      | 1    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3     | 0.3                    |
| East Picacho        | 2             | 2    |      | 1   | 2   | 1   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 8     | 0.9                    |
| Fairacres           | 1             | 1    |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 2     | 0.2                    |
| Hermosa             |               |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |                        |
| Heights             | 4             | 4    | 4    | 4   | 4   | 4   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 24    | 2.6                    |
| Loma Heights        | 17            | 13   | 14   | 11  | 11  | 5   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 71    | 7.7                    |
| Lucero              | 5             | 3    | 2    | 2   | 4   | 1   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 17    | 1.9                    |
| MacArthur           | 6             | 2    | 4    | 3   | 2   | 1   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 18    | 2.0                    |
| Mesilla             | 3             | 1    | 6    | 1   | 2   | 3   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 16    | 1.7                    |
| Mesilla Park        | 3             | 3    | 2    | 5   | 7   | 6   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 26    | 2.8                    |
| University          |               |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |                        |
| Hills               | 21            | 14   | 19   | 18  | 7   | 16  |     |     |     |     |     |     | 95    | 10.3                   |
| Valley View         | 1             | 3    | 1    | 2   | 4   | 4   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 15    | 1.6                    |
| Washington          | 3             | 10   | 3    | 6   | 2   | 2   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 26    | 2.8                    |
| Total               |               |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 551   | 59.8                   |
| Junior High         |               |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |                        |
| Alameda             |               |      |      |     |     |     | 35  | 42  | 34  |     |     |     | 111   | 12.1                   |
| Court               |               |      |      |     |     |     | 10  | 5   | 10  |     |     |     | 25    | 2.7                    |
| Lynn                |               |      |      |     |     |     | 34  | 30  | 25  |     |     |     | 89    | 9.7                    |
| Total               |               |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 225   | 24.5                   |
| Senior High         |               |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |                        |
| Las Cruces          |               |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     | 25  | 31  | 30  | 86    | 9.4                    |
| Mayfield            |               |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     | 34  | 24  |     | 58    | 6.3                    |
| Total               |               |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 144   | 15.9                   |
| GRAND TOTAL         | 112           | 96   | 111  | 79  | 83  | 70  | 79  | 77  | 69  | 59  | 55  | 30  | 920   | 100.0*                 |
| PERCENT OF<br>TOTAL | 12.2          | 10.4 | 12.1 | 8.6 | 9.0 | 7.6 | 8.6 | 8.4 | 7.5 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 3.2 | 100.0 |                        |

\*This figure does not equal the total accumulated percentages due to rounding.